

in the light of contemporary thought and current problems."

Luc Mundt has been called a dangerous book. If it is to be placed in this Category, let us be very clear as to why it is to be so placed. "Ecce Homo" and "Essays and Reviews" are dangerous books because of their tone and general drift; there is a poison working in and through them. *Luc Mundt* can in no such sense be called a dangerous book. Its authors hold the Catholic Faith as they hold their lives. There is no latent tendency no inevitable though concealed abyss.

The objector would be satisfied to state his case thus: "It would be a capital book if it weren't for those unfortunate"—he might use a stronger word—"remarks of Gore's on the Old Testament and Inspiration, and some rather unnecessarily liberal concessions to 'evolution' in chapter V., *The Incarnation and Development*, by Illingworth." It is not to be supposed that the authors were unaware that the presence of these two elements would in certain quarters seriously endanger the reputation of their book. Nor can it be thought that they would have thus weighted their book without very strong reasons. I think we can find the reasons.

If we ask ourselves what has been the chief cause of dismay in the rank and file of the Christian army during the last forty years we can answer without a moment's hesitation the oft-repeated, "our position has been turned, we must retire." Now these repeated retreats are due not to the weakness of the Christian position, but because certain supposed defenders have thought to hold outlying positions to which they had no right. Consequently when the true claimant appeared these Christian guerillas beat a hasty retreat. Then a hue and cry is raised, "Christianity is being defeated, Christianity is perishing." Such being the case is it not more satisfactory to give up rash dogmatizing against this or that theory of "evolution," for instance, and to consider that dogmatism on such a point is in reality to limit the mode of divine operation? It may be that the evolutionist will ultimately find chasms which he cannot bridge; but suppose he should bridge these chasms would Christianity then be a thing of the past? Would not such a conclusion be equivalent to saying that Christianity can retain its Faith as long as its God is seen to work partly according to "evolution," but must give it up if God is seen to work altogether according to such a law? If "evolution" bridges every chasm then "our Creator will be known to have worked otherwise indeed than we had thought, but in a way quite as conceivable, and to the imaginative more magnificent."

With regard to Old Testament criticism and Inspiration the question is not dissimilar. The critics claim that certain facts are sure, and they then proceed to draw inferences which are often anti-Christian. In some quarters these facts are ridiculed as if they were the wildest theories, without any attempt being made to refute them, with the result that many men accept the facts together with the anti-Christian inferences, thinking that this is quite as deplorable a state of things as meeting Darwinism with ridicule. Mr. Gore claims that "the Church is not prevented from admitting these to be open questions," and, assuming for the sake of reassuring doubtful minds, the worst that criticism can do, he then proceeds to show that the anti-Christian inferences no more follow as the logical result of these facts, than it follows that because Darwinism is true Christianity is false.

Surely this is a reasonable position. The purpose of his essay is as he says, "not to inquire how much we can, without irrationality, believe inspiration to involve; but rather how much can legitimately and without real loss be

conceded." For without doubt if, consistently with entire loyalty to our Lord and his Church, we can regard as open the questions specified above, we are removing great obstacles from the path to belief of many who certainly wish to believe, and do not exhibit any undue scepticism. It is to be carefully noted that Mr. Gore does not assert that these "assured results" of criticism are proved, he merely shows that if they should be proved it by no means follows that the deductions which have been drawn are likewise proved.

He anticipates criticism by saying, "We shall probably be told to remember Tübingen," and his reply is worth pondering, "If the Christian Church has been enabled to defeat the critical attack, so far as it threatened destruction to the historical basis of the New Testament it has not been by foreclosing the question with an appeal to dogma, but by facing in fair and frank discussion the problems raised. A similar treatment of Old Testament problems will enable us to distinguish between what is reasonable and reverent, and what is high handed and irreligious in contemporary criticism, whether German, French or English." We hope in a second paper to touch upon some things which want of space forbids us to notice.

E. C. CAYLEY.

"THE BUTTERFLY."

BORN with the springtime, dying with the rose,
Basking on zephyr's wings in the pure sky;
Hov'ring o'er the leaves of sweet opening buds,
Entranced with perfume, light and balmy air;
Shaking, still young, the powder from its wings,
Fluttering light as air, in the azure vault,
Behold the butterfly's enchanted life!
It resembles the unsatisfied longing
Which ceases not, till forsaking all else
It seeks in Heaven its truest happiness.

—Translated from Lamartine, by E. C.

THE CELESTIAL EMIGRANT.

LEST any reader should imagine he is about to be treated to a treatise on a future existence, let me hasten to correct the impression. My subject is essentially terrestrial; the matter is material, and the material is Chinese, one I know something of from personal experience and personal contact.

I had better, I think, for the benefit of the anti-Chinese Canadian, assert at once that I am pro-Chinese, a Chinese champion, a Chinese convert. Four years and a half ago I went out to British Columbia so prejudiced in my views that I was most indignant at finding a Celestial engaged for my establishment. Now, I prefer one Chinaman to ten maid servants, for whose services I would not under compulsion exchange Tan Sing's. Now I combat this race prejudice in Ontario and even in British Columbia, except among the Provincials, who equally endorse the Mongolian, having discovered his use as well as his abuse. Probably Vancouver represents to the untravelled Canadian the principal part of British Columbia; it does not, however, represent the British Columbian element, as he will soon discover, because its population has been drawn from Ontario in particular and Canada, the States and foreign parts in general. Hence the jealousy of Vancouver's growth and prosperity evinced by Victoria and New Westminster, which are essentially Provincial and hence the animosity to the Chinese, which has become the subject of Dominion Legislation, emanates from that Pacific metropolis.

The average Canadian tourist forms his opinion of the Mongolian from the casual visits he pays to the Chinatowns of Victoria and San Francisco, not from personal observation